

# SCIENTIFIC DATA

OPEN

## SUBJECT CATEGORIES

» RNA sequencing  
» Computational biology  
and bioinformatics

## Data Descriptor: *Daphnia magna* transcriptome by RNA-Seq across 12 environmental stressors

Luisa Orsini<sup>1</sup>, Donald Gilbert<sup>2</sup>, Ram Podicheti<sup>3,4</sup>, Mieke Jansen<sup>5</sup>, James B. Brown<sup>6</sup>, Omid Shams Solari<sup>6</sup>, Katina I. Spanier<sup>5</sup>, John K. Colbourne<sup>1</sup>, Douglas Rush<sup>4</sup>, Ellen Decaestecker<sup>7</sup>, Jana Asselman<sup>8</sup>, Karel A.C. De Schamphelaere<sup>8</sup>, Dieter Ebert<sup>9</sup>, Christoph R. Haag<sup>10</sup>, Jouni Kvist<sup>11</sup>, Christian Laforsch<sup>12</sup>, Adam Petrusek<sup>13</sup>, Andrew P. Beckerman<sup>14</sup>, Tom J. Little<sup>15</sup>, Anurag Chaturvedi<sup>5</sup>, Michael E. Pfrender<sup>16,\*</sup>, Luc De Meester<sup>5,\*</sup> & Mikko J. Frilander<sup>11,\*</sup>

Received: 21 December 2015

Accepted: 19 April 2016

Published: 10 May 2016

The full exploration of gene-environment interactions requires model organisms with well-characterized ecological interactions in their natural environment, manipulability in the laboratory and genomic tools. The waterflea *Daphnia magna* is an established ecological and toxicological model species, central to the food webs of freshwater lentic habitats and sentinel for water quality. Its tractability and cyclic parthenogenetic life-cycle are ideal to investigate links between genes and the environment. Capitalizing on this unique model system, the STRESSFLEA consortium generated a comprehensive RNA-Seq data set by exposing two inbred genotypes of *D. magna* and a recombinant cross of these genotypes to a range of environmental perturbations. Gene models were constructed from the transcriptome data and mapped onto the draft genome of *D. magna* using EvidentialGene. The transcriptome data generated here, together with the available draft genome sequence of *D. magna* and a high-density genetic map will be a key asset for future investigations in environmental genomics.

<sup>1</sup>Environmental Genomics Group, School of Biosciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK.

<sup>2</sup>Biology Department, Indiana University, 1001 E. Third Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA. <sup>3</sup>School of Informatics and Computing, Indiana University, 919 E. Tenth Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47408, USA. <sup>4</sup>Center for Genomics and Bioinformatics, Indiana University, School of Informatics and Computing, Indiana University, 1001 E. Third Street, 919 E. Tenth Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47408, USA. <sup>5</sup>Laboratory of Aquatic Ecology, Evolution and Conservation, University of Leuven, Ch. Deberiotstraat 32, Leuven 3000, Belgium. <sup>6</sup>Department of Genome Dynamics Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, USA. <sup>7</sup>Aquatic Biology, Interdisciplinary research Facility Life Sciences KU Leuven Campus Kortrijk, E. Sabbelaan 53, Kortrijk B-8500, Belgium. <sup>8</sup>Laboratory of Environmental Toxicology and Aquatic Ecology, GhEnToxLab, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. <sup>9</sup>Universität Basel, Zoologisches Institut, Vesalgasse 1, Basel 4051, Switzerland. <sup>10</sup>Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive—CEFE UMR 5175, CNRS—Université de Montpellier—Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier—EPHE, campus CNRS, 1919, route de Mende, Montpellier, Cedex 5 34293, France. <sup>11</sup>Institute of Biotechnology, University of Helsinki, PO Box 56, Viikinkaari 9, 00014, Helsinki Finland. <sup>12</sup>Animal Ecology I and Bayreuth Center of Ecology and Environmental Research (BayCEER), University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth 95440, Germany. <sup>13</sup>Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague, Viničná 7, Prague CZ-12844, Czech Republic. <sup>14</sup>Department of Animal and Plant Science, University of Sheffield Alfred Denny Building, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK. <sup>15</sup>Ashworth Laboratories, Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Kings Buildings, Edinburgh EH9 3JT, UK. <sup>16</sup>Department of Biological Sciences and Environmental Change Initiative, Galvin Life Science Center, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA. \*These authors jointly supervised this work. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to L.O. (email: l.orsini@bham.ac.uk).

<b>Design Type(s)</b>	parallel group design • replicate design • strain comparison design • stimulus or stress design • transcription profiling by high throughput sequencing design
<b>Measurement Type(s)</b>	transcription profiling assay
<b>Technology Type(s)</b>	Whole Transcriptome Sequencing
<b>Factor Type(s)</b>	selectively maintained organism • biological replicate role • exposure of material to environment
<b>Sample Characteristic(s)</b>	<i>Daphnia magna</i> • multicellular organism

## Background & Summary

Illuminating the link between genes and environment is an exciting yet challenging goal. The full exploration of this link requires model organisms with well-characterized ecological interactions in nature, tractability in the laboratory and available genomic tools. The waterflea *Daphnia magna* Straus satisfies these requirements<sup>1,2</sup>. *D. magna* occurs in lakes and ponds in Europe, Africa, Asia and America<sup>3,4</sup>. It has a prominent ecological role in pelagic freshwater food webs, where it is the primary forage for many vertebrate and invertebrate predators<sup>5–7</sup>, an efficient grazer of algae<sup>8</sup>, including cyanobacteria<sup>9</sup>, a strong competitor for other zooplankters<sup>10</sup> and in a constant evolutionary race with parasites<sup>11</sup>. Experimental tractability is high in *Daphnia* because of the short generation time, comparable to the genetic model species *Drosophila*. The small body size enables experimental approaches on large populations, and the cyclic parthenogenetic life cycle enables the parallel analysis of functional and fitness changes in the same genotype in multiple environmental conditions. Moreover, species of the genus *Daphnia* are renowned models in ecotoxicology and are widely used as indicators of water quality and environmental health<sup>12–16</sup>. They are also key models in evolutionary biology and the study of adaptive responses to environmental change<sup>17–21</sup>.

Capitalizing on this unique model system, the STRESSFLEA consortium, a research network funded by the ESF EUROCORES Programme EuroEEFG, generated a comprehensive RNA-Seq data set obtained from two natural genotypes, subsequently inbred in the laboratory, and a recombinant line of *D. magna*, obtained from the crossing of the two inbred genotypes, exposed to a suite of biotic and abiotic environmental perturbations. The two inbred genotypes were collected from two ecologically different habitats in the species distributional range. One of the inbred strains has been used to obtain the first draft genome of *D. magna* v2.4 (GenBank LRGB000000000).

Genome-wide transcription profiling was obtained from the three genotypes following environmental perturbations. The EvidentialGene method based on combined RNA-assembly and genome-based modelling of euGenes eukaryote genome informatics (<http://eugen.es.org/EvidentialGene/>)<sup>22</sup> was used to generate a public gene set for *D. magna* with as complete and accurate gene and transcript repertoire as possible. EvidentialGene uses evidence from public gene expression and protein datasets to annotate new genes. Briefly, for each gene, different models are tested and ranked based on quality scores and on deterministic evidence. Selecting the best representative model for a locus from among a large set of models is accomplished over two criteria: (1) gene evidence must pass a minimum threshold score, and (2) the combined score is maximal for all models overlapping the same coding sequence locations. Other criteria and tests are included and used for classification, such as orthology scores, CDS/UTR quality, and expression and intron evidence. The algorithm used for evidence scoring attempts to match expert choices, using base-level and gene model quality metrics. Determining a final gene set is an iterative process that involves evaluation and expert examination of problematic cases, modification of score weights, and reselection.

The data generated here combined with the *D. magna* draft reference genome and a genetic map available for this species<sup>23</sup> will open a new era for environmental genomics. These genome and gene data sets are publicly available in the interactive *Daphnia* genome database at wFleaBase.org<sup>24</sup>. This database includes a genome map viewer with an option to display expression data (for example from this study) and genome annotation data from *Daphnia pulex* and related species, as well as search functions for queries at sequence, gene function, expression, orthology and annotation levels. The RNA-Seq data generated in this study will enable us to disentangle the relative contribution of genetic adaptation and phenotypic plasticity to adaptation in presence of both natural and anthropogenic stressors. Such investigations are possible because of the rich ecological data available for *Daphnia*, which is arguably the best studied model system in terms of phenotypic and genetic responses to ecological stressors<sup>1,2</sup>. In combination with the key assets of this model system for experimental work, the transcriptomic data deposited here will enable unprecedented advances in environmental, population and functional genomics.

## Methods

### Strains


Two inbred genotypes derived from natural strains, and a recombinant line derived from a cross of these two strains, were used to generate the transcriptome of *D. magna*. The two natural strains were collected from a system of ephemeral rock pools from the northern distributional range of the species (Xinb3, South west Finland 59.833183, 23.260387) and a fish-rearing pond in Southern Germany (Iinb1, Germany, 48.206375, 11.709727), respectively. The Xinb3 genotype was the result of three generations of selfing, and the Iinb1 strain was selfed for one generation, leading to a predicted 87.5 and 50% reduction in their original level of heterozygosity, respectively. The recombinant line is an F2 laboratory strain part of a mapping panel supporting research on the genetic basis of adaptive traits in *D. magna*<sup>23,25</sup>. The strains will hereafter be referred to as X- Xinb3, I- Iinb1, and XI-recombinant line.

### Environmental perturbations and experimental design

Genome-wide transcription profiles were obtained from the three strains following environmental perturbation by a suite of environmental challenges. Exposures to environmental perturbations on the two inbred strains were conducted at the University of Leuven, Belgium. The sequencing for this experiment was performed at the Finnish Institute of Molecular Medicine (FIMM, Technology Centre, Sequencing unit) at the University of Helsinki. Exposures of the recombinant line were completed at the University of Notre Dame, IN, USA. The sequencing data from this experiment were obtained at the JP Sulzberger Columbia Genome Center (<https://systemsbiology.columbia.edu/genome-center>). All exposures to environmental perturbations were conducted using the protocol described below. All three genotypes were maintained in the laboratory for several generations after selfing (X and I) or crossing (XI) to reduce interference from maternal effect prior to the exposures to environmental perturbations.

**Inbred genotypes (X and I).** For the exposure to environmental perturbations, the genotypes were grown in climate chambers with a fixed long day photoperiod (16 h light/8 h dark) at 20 °C. The first generation was cultured at a density of 10 individuals/l, and increased to 50 individuals/l in the second generation to enable the harvesting of enough offspring for the environmental perturbation exposure. Animals were harvested and exposed in ADaM medium (Aachener Daphnien Medium:<sup>26</sup>). The medium was renewed every second day in the harvesting phase and the daphnids were fed daily with 150,000 cells *Scenedesmus obliquus*/ml. The diet changed to a 2:1 *S. obliquus*:*Cryptomonas* sp. mix from the second generation onwards to provide the animals with optimal food quality. When multiple genotypes were used in the same experimental set up, they were synchronized for at least two generations prior to the actual exposures. The second clutch of the second generation was used for exposures to environmental perturbations. Five-day old juveniles at a density of 100 juveniles/l were exposed for 4 h to the different environmental challenges (Fig. 1). Prior to separating the juveniles for the actual exposures, they were grown in groups of 1,000 in 10 l aquaria for four days. The aquaria were fed daily 150,000 cells per ml in a 2:1 *S. obliquus*: *Cryptomonas* sp. Half of the medium was replaced every second day. The animals were not supplied with food during the perturbation exposures to reduce contamination from algae in the sequencing phase. Seven environmental perturbations were imposed on the inbred strains. These consisted of six biotic and one abiotic stressor. The biotic stressors were: kairomone signalling of vertebrate and invertebrate predation, exposure to *Pasteuria ramosa* parasite spores, crowding, and grazing on toxic and non-toxic cyanobacteria; the abiotic stressor was the pesticide Carbaryl (1-naphthyl methylcarbamate, Sigma-Aldrich, Germany) (Fig. 1). To mimic fish predation, *Daphnia* were exposed to kairomones-enriched medium obtained from growing 19 sticklebacks in 100 l of water. This medium was obtained from aquaria in which fish was reared. Medium in the fish aquaria was refreshed daily, and kairomone-loaded medium was prepared by filtering the medium over a 0.2 µm filter. This kairomone-loaded medium was added to the *Daphnia* cultures to constitute 10% of the total volume. Similarly, invertebrate predation was mimicked by exposing *Daphnia* to kairomones-enriched medium obtained from growing an adult tadpole shrimp *Triops* in 2 l of water. This medium was obtained by filtering the kairomone-loaded medium on a 0.2 µm filter. Similarly to the fish kairomone experiment, the filtered medium was added to the *Daphnia* cultures to constitute 10% of the total volume. Experimental animals in the parasite treatment were exposed to a solution containing 40,000 spores/ml of *P. ramosa*, a parasite known to have strong fitness consequences in *Daphnia*<sup>11</sup>. Crowding stress was imposed by increasing the number of experimental animals per volume of medium: 100 individuals in 250 ml of medium as compared to 100 individuals in 1 l. Perturbation from cyanobacteria was obtained by feeding *Daphnia* with a toxic strain of *Microcystis aeruginosa* (Cyanobacteria, strain MT50) and a non-toxic strain of *Microcystis aeruginosa* (strain CCAP 1450/1)<sup>9</sup>. The experimental animals were exposed to the pesticide Carbaryl in a concentration of 8 µg l<sup>-1</sup>, known to cause appreciable sublethal stress and increased mortality<sup>27</sup>. The exposures of the inbred strains were completed over two days. For each day a control (no stress) was run in parallel to the environmental perturbations. We performed five biological replicates for each treatment, including controls. Each consisted of ca. 80 sub-adult animals.

**Recombinant genotype (XI).** The recombinant line was maintained as described above for the parental genotypes with the exception that recombinant *Daphnia* were maintained in 1 l containers throughout the rearing phases and for the experimental phase, third generation individuals at eight days



**Figure 1.** Workflow of environmental perturbations. Two natural genotypes of *D. magna* collected from Finland (Xinb3-X) and Germany (Iinb1-I) and a recombinant line (XI) obtained from the cross of the two natural genotypes were used in experimental perturbations. The three genotypes were synchronized for two generations. The second clutch of the second generation was exposed to environmental perturbations. The environmental perturbations for the natural genotypes were as follows: **FI**: Vertebrate predation mimicked by fish kairomones released by 19 sticklebacks in 100 l water; **TR**: Invertebrate predation mimicked by kairomones released by 1 adult *Triops* in 2 l water; **PA**: exposure to parasite spores by the common parasite *Pasteuria ramosa*—40,000 spores ml<sup>-1</sup>; **CR**: crowding exposure conditions are of 100 individuals/250 ml; **BX** Toxic Cyanobacteria—strain MT50; **BN** Non-toxic Cyanobacteria—strain CCAP 1450/1; **CA**: exposure to the pesticide Carbaryl—8 µg l<sup>-1</sup>; **CO**: control. The environmental perturbations for the recombinant line were as follows: **CD**: Cadmium—6 µg l<sup>-1</sup>; **PB**: Lead—278 µg l<sup>-1</sup>; **pH 5.5**; **UV** light; **NaCl**—5 g l<sup>-1</sup>; **CO** Control.

old were exposed to five abiotic perturbations linked to anthropogenic disturbance. These exposures included: cadmium (Cd), lead (Pb), low pH (5.5), UV light, and sodium chloride (NaCl) (Fig. 1). The experimental treatments included a single control of individuals placed in fresh media without algae for a 24 h period. All treatments and the control included three biological replicates. The metal exposures were maintained for 24 h at concentrations of 6 µg l<sup>-1</sup> and 278 µg l<sup>-1</sup> for Cd and Pb, respectively. *Daphnia* were also exposed to pH 5.5 and media supplemented with 5 g/l NaCl for 24 h. UV light treatments were conducted in 250 ml beakers containing 50 ml of media. Beakers were placed 10.5 cm below 30 W, 36-inch Reptisun 5.0 UVB fluorescent light bulbs for 4 h (Zoo Med Laboratories Inc., San Luis Obispo, CA, USA)<sup>20</sup>. Exposure to UV light was restricted to 4 h to avoid high mortality observed at 24 h. All recombinant line exposures were conducted at 18 °C and RNA collection was timed to occur at the same time period to minimize circadian variation in expression patterns among treatments.

### RNA isolation

**Inbred genotypes (X and I).** Five biological replicates for each genotype were perturbed with the environmental conditions explained above and RNA-Seq generated from three of the five biological replicates. Having a larger set of exposed biological replicates per genotypes allowed us to choose the three replicates with the highest RNA quality. Total RNA was extracted from pools of ca. 80 juveniles from each genotype and replica by homogenization in the presence of Trizol reagent followed by acidic phenol extraction as described in (ref. 28) and ethanol precipitation. Quality of the isolated RNA was confirmed with Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) and only samples showing no RNA degradation were used in subsequent steps. Sequencing was performed on 49 samples: 3 replicates x 2 genotypes x 8 conditions (2 controls were run for genotype X, making the total number of run samples 49, as the environmental exposures were spread over two days).

**Recombinant genotype (XI).** Total RNA was extracted from pools of ca. 50 individuals from each replicate (18 samples: 3 replicates x 6 conditions including control) by homogenization in Trizol reagent

and isolating RNA using a Qiagen RNeasy column (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) with on column DNase treatment. RNA quality was assessed as above.

### Construction of RNA-seq libraries

The experimental procedure from library construction to sequencing and downstream analysis was identical for the three genotypes and was as follows.

Library construction was performed on three biological replicates. 1–3 µg of total-RNA was used for isolating poly-A RNA (Dynabeads mRNA purification kit, Ambion, Life Technologies, AS, Oslo, Norway). The poly-A RNA was reverse transcribed to ds-cDNA (SuperScript Double-Stranded cDNA Synthesis Kit, Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA, USA). Random hexamers (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA, USA) were used for priming the first strand synthesis reaction and SPRI beads (Agencourt AMPure XP, Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA, USA) for purification of cDNA. Illumina compatible Nextera Technology (Illumina, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA) was used for preparation of RNA-seq libraries. 60 ng of ds-cDNA was fragmented and tagged using *in vitro* cut-and-paste transposition. The fragmented cDNA was purified with SPRI beads. In order to add the Illumina specific bridge-PCR compatible sites and enrich the library, limited-cycle PCR (5 cycles) was done according to instructions of Nextera system with minor modifications. For bar coded libraries, 50X Nextera Adaptor 2 was replaced with a bar coded Illumina-compatible adaptor from the Nextera Bar Codes kit in PCR setup. SPRI beads were used for purification of the PCR-products and the library QC was evaluated by Agilent Bioanalyzer. Libraries were size selected (350–700 bp) in 2% agarose gel, purified with QIAQuick Gel Extraction kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) and the library QC was evaluated by Agilent Bioanalyzer.

### RNA-seq library sequencing

C-Bot (TruSeq PE Cluster Kit v3, Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA) was used for cluster generation and Illumina HiSeq2000 platform (TruSeq SBS Kit v3 reagent kit) for paired-end sequencing with 101 bp read length. Sequence data for the inbred genotypes were generated by the FIMM sequencing unit at the University of Helsinki, Finland whereas data from the recombinant genotype were generated by the JP Sulzberger Columbia Genome Center (New York, NY, USA).

### RNA-Seq quality check

Read sequences were subjected to adapter trimming and quality filtering using Trimmomatic ver.0.33 (ref. 29). RNA-Seq reads were checked for foreign RNA contamination. Human and mouse contaminant sequences were screened and removed by mapping *D. magna* reads onto ncbigno2014-human.rna and ncbigno2014-mouse.rna using bowtie2 ver.2.1.0 (ref. 30). Finally, 80% of the reads for the inbred genotypes and 99% of the reads for the recombinant genotype were retained (Q>20). Contaminant screening is essential for transcriptome and genome projects; in this study contaminants of 100% RNA identity to mouse, human, and various bacteria genes were found in all source sets, even though not in all replicates. Care should also be taken to avoid false positive contaminant flags, as putative horizontal gene transfer (HGT); one such case was identified in the current dataset. The cleaned reads were mapped onto the reference transcriptome of *D. magna* obtained from *de novo* assembly of RNA-Seq data. These data consisted mostly of the Xinb3 inbred genotype data, but also included a subset of data from the Iinb1 genotype and RNA-Seq available in public databases for *D. magna* at the time of the analysis (mostly<sup>31</sup>). This reference transcriptome includes only primary transcripts. The mapping of reads from the three genotypes was conducted using Bowtie2 ver.2.1.0 (ref. 30) allowing a maximum edit distance of 3 per read. 74% of the reads mapped on the reference transcriptome and 82% of those mapped to a unique location. The remaining reads mapped to multiple locations suggesting that those are alternative transcripts or incomplete genes that cannot be accurately mapped. These reads will be the object of further investigations.

As an additional assessment of sequence quality, we counted base positions in which more than two allelic variants were present, hence departing from the expectation of a maximum of two alleles at a given position for a diploid organism. For this analysis reads from all treatments for each genotype were pooled and mapped against a reference sequence set of single copy genes from the *D. magna* consensus transcriptome. The mapping process was performed using bowtie2 ver. 2.1.0 30 reporting up to a maximum of 20 valid alignments per read (-k 20); from this pool, alignments with least edit distance were selected as best hits for a specific read. Allelic variants as compared to the reference consensus sequence were identified using samtools mpileup command (samtools ver. 0.1.19, 45), and a custom parser written in perl. The minimum base quality score required for a variation to be considered was q = 20 where q is the threshold measured. Variant calls with frequencies below 1% representing typical Illumina sequencing errors<sup>32</sup> were excluded. The variant positions with 2, 3 or 4 allelic variants were counted.

### Transcriptome and gene set construction

**Transcriptome assembly of RNA.** We used EvidentialGene methods from the euGenes.org<sup>22</sup> project to assemble RNA-seq, as well as annotate and validate transcripts per strain. After assembling transcripts per strain, we constructed a complete gene set across strains incorporating chromosome assembly data available for *D. magna* (draft genome assembly 2.4, GenBank LRGB000000000). Paired end RNA-Seq reads, totalling 7.2 billion reads from the current project and 2 billion reads from published data at the



time of the analysis<sup>31</sup>, were assembled *de-novo* with several RNA assemblers, using multiple options for kmer fragmenting, insert sizes, read coverage, digital normalization, and quality and abundance filtering. *De-novo* RNA assemblers used include Velvet/Oases<sup>33,34</sup> [v1.2.03/o0.2.06], SOAPdenovo-Trans<sup>35</sup> [v2011.12.22] using multi-kmer shredding options from 23 to 95 bp, and Trinity<sup>36</sup> [v2012.03.17] (with fixed kmer option). Accessory methods used for RNA data processing include GMAP/GSNAP and Bowtie for read and transcript mapping to genome assembly, diginorm of khmer package, and sequence artefact filtering. Additional transcripts were assembled with genome-mapping assistance, using PASA<sup>37</sup> [v2.2011], Cufflinks<sup>38</sup> [v1.0.3 and v0.8], and EvidentialGene. EvidentialGene *tr2aacds* software pipeline (<http://eugenenes.org/EvidentialGene/trassembly.html>) was used to process the resulting assemblies obtained from coding sequences. The assemblies were then translated to proteins, scored for gene evidence including CDS/UTR quality and homology, and reduced to a biologically informative transcriptome of primary and alternate transcripts. We submitted to NCBI only the primary transcripts; alternate transcripts are available at wFleaBase.org.

**Gene set construction.** Gene models were also predicted on the draft *D. magna* genome assembly with genome-modelling methods, using AUGUSTUS<sup>39</sup>, and were incorporated in this public gene set version evg7f9b. Accessory gene set annotation, validation and processing methods included NCBI BLAST suite, exonerate (protein alignment), lastz (sequence alignment), GMAP (gene mapper), CD-Hit (sequence clustering), MUMmer (sequence alignment), MCL (markov clustering), Muscle (sequence alignment), RepeatMasker (repeat and transposon finding), rnaexpress, samtools (rna), SNAP (gene modeller), Splign (alignment), and several database extracts of arthropod and eukaryote genes, proteins and other sequences. A set of primary and alternate transcripts per locus was determined with CDS-overlap discrimination and weighted sum of the several gene evidence scores per transcript model. In hybrid gene set constructions, such as the one presented here, errors occur from both genome map modelling and mRNA assembly, and discrepancies between methods need to be resolved from available gene evidence. The algorithm used for this gene set construction was Evidential Gene and includes three stages:

**Stage 1.** Transcript assemblies of mRNA-seq are performed with several *de-novo* assemblers and parameters, followed by EvidentialGene *tr2aacds* redundancy removal for each assembly set.

**Stage 2.** Locus/alternate gene classification is performed from assembly sets obtained in stage 1 to produce non-redundant gene assemblies for each strain using several attributes: transcript alignment classification (*tr2aacds*), genome-map location and consensus map loci, consensus protein homology and quality, and cross-strain transcript consensus (MCL clustering of transcript alignments<sup>40</sup>).

**Stage 3.** A candidate locus/alternate gene set for the species is produced from the non-redundant strain sets, using several gene consensus measures across strains, expert curation and computational reclassification. Cases of alternate/paralog discrimination and mis-mapping are investigated in this step using consensus of gene structure among strains, protein orthology analyses, and consensus location on *D. magna* and the sister species *D. pulex* chromosome assemblies.

Stage1 produced separate RNA assemblies for the three genotypes, amounting to 16.5 M transcripts for X, 9.5 M for I, and 3.7 M for XI, plus a 4th genome-assisted *de-novo* assembly of 1 M transcripts from weak expressed loci (X genotype). Stage 2 produced 1.0 M non-redundant mRNA transcripts ranging from 35,000 to 270,000 transcripts per set across 7 gene sets obtained from strain and genome-based inferences. The gene set obtained in this second stage is derived from 30 million mRNA assemblies obtained in stage 1. Stage 3 involved cross-strain consensus locus determination, including paralog/alternate discrimination, iterative reclassification and refinements, reducing the total set to 29,128 loci and primary transcripts, with 84,882 alternative transcripts found among 17,473 of those loci.

Gene homology evidence for the gene construction pipeline includes 300,000 proteins from 10 species: the waterfleas *Daphnia magna* and *Daphnia pulex* (version 2010, wFleaBase.org), the tiger shrimp *Penaeus monodon* (2013 EvidentialGene), the flour beetle *Tribolium castaneum* (2014 NCBI), the beetle *Pogonius chalceus* (2013 EvidentialGene), the honeybee *Apis mellifera* (2014 NCBI), the wasp *Nasonia vitripennis* (2010 EvidentialGene), the fruitfly *Drosophila melanogaster* (rel5.30 2012), the fish *Maylandia zebra* (NCBI 2014) and humans (UniProt 2011). Orthology and paralogy criteria were assigned using all versus all reciprocal blastp of these species, followed by OrthoMCL<sup>41</sup> alignment clustering of genes (Dmag analysis version arp7bor5 in wFleaBase.org). Gene names were assigned to our models on the basis of homology scores to UniProt proteins. The consensus gene family names were obtained from OrthoMCL orthology analyses, in accordance with UniProt protein naming guidelines<sup>42</sup>.

The basic approach employed by EvidentialGene is similar to other eukaryote genome annotation methods, including NCBI Eukaryote genome annotation pipeline<sup>43</sup> ([http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation\\_euk/process/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/annotation_euk/process/)), ENSEMBL genome annotation pipeline ([http://www.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/genome\\_annotation.html](http://www.ensembl.org/info/genome/genebuild/genome_annotation.html)), TIGR and Broad genome annotation software<sup>44</sup>, and MAKER<sup>45</sup>. It differs from these other approaches for its deterministic evidence scoring, detailed per gene annotations, and single-best model/locus approach. A notable divergence from these other methods is the use of hybrid mRNA-assembly and genome modelling which increases the accuracy and completeness of the gene sets generated.

### Assessing the gene set completeness

Orthology completeness, presence and full length of orthology genes were assessed with OrthoMCL in several steps of the gene set construction and in particular during stage 3 (Table 1). For an independent quantitative assessment of orthology completeness we used BUSCO (Benchmarking Universal Single-Copy Orthologs, v1.1, <http://busco.ezlab.org/><sup>46</sup>), a recognized benchmark approach for single copy orthologs providing an assessment of orthologs conserved among species. Deviations from completeness are commonly interpreted as technical or, less frequently, biological deviations from the expected gene complement. We compared the gene models of *D. magna* (dmagset7finloc9b.mRNA gene set) with the BUSCO arthropod profiles. In addition, we compared our gene model with the one of four other arthropod species including *Daphnia pulex*, *Apis mellifera*, *Tribolium castaneum* and *Drosophila melanogaster*. Our analysis includes also multiple genes sets from the same species. Different genes sets are identified with year and source: 1) **Dma\_14EV** described here using EvidentialGene methods, 2) **Dma\_11G** obtained from genome-modelled *D. magna* genes from 2011 (this gene set will be described in a separate paper presenting the first draft genome of *D. magna*), 3) **Dpu\_10EG** and 4) **Dpu\_07G** available for *D. pulex*; 5) **Ame\_14EV** obtained from *Apis mellifera* RNA-seq publicly available using EvidentialGene methods; 6) **Ame\_12G** apis45: OGS v3.2 genome genes; 7) **Tca\_14EV** obtained from *Tribolium castaneum* RNA-seq publicly available using EvidentialGene methods; 8) other Ame and Tca publicly available gene sets; 9) **Fly13** and **Fly04** generated in 2013 and 2004 for *Drosophila melanogaster*.

Input_Tr	NR_out	Name	Source
Stage 1			
3,751,425	140192	dmagset36m	Labbe <i>et al.</i> 2012May (Dapma6rm, daphmag3, dmag2vel, tag41 id patt)
16,454,489	256607	dmagset56tx	X assembly, 2014Jun-2013Aug (Dapma6tx, hsX, ndX, vel4x id patt)
9,469,773	272398	dmagset56ri	I assembly, 2014May (Dapma6ti, hsl, vel4i id patt)
1,000,000	64487	dmagset56ru	Assembly from X weakly expressed genes, 1st pass unassembled reads 2014Jun (Dapma6rx, xun, nun id patt)
Stage 2			
34530		dmagset1m8	Genome predicted 2011 (m8AUG id patt)
140192		dmagset36m	Labbe <i>et al.</i> rna 2012 May (Dapma6rm, daphmag3, dmag2vel, tag41 id patt)
256607		dmagset56tx	X assembly, 2014Jun-2013Aug (Dapma6tx, hsX, ndX, vel4x id patt)
272398		dmagset56ri	I assembly, 2014 May (Dapma6ti, hsl, vel4i ids) of 9469773 input trasn
64487		dmagset56ru	Assembly from X weakly expressed genes, 1st pass unassembled reads 2014 Jun (Dapma6rx, xun, nun ids)
120122		dmagset4pub1208	Present study rna data 2012 Aug, X mostly, used to fill in missed loci
182909		dmagset5xpub1401	Pre-release 2014Jan, used to fill in missed loci, from 2013–2010 transcripts
Stage 3			
Name	nLoci	Notes	
pubset1	97140	evg7vose-tr2aacds, input of 4 separately assembled and reduced RNA-seq sets (3-clones) and genome-predict set, no-omcl 04Jul2014. Sets 4 (1208) and 5 (1401) were not pubset1 inputs.	
pubset2	44762	no-omcl 24Jul2014; cross-clone consensus classification (MCG loci/alts common across clone sets)	
pubset3	28363	arp7aor1 orthology set, 30Jul2014	
pubset4	27239	no-omcl 14Aug2014; intron-miss loci, paralog/alt reclass	
pubset5	27218	no-omcl 19Aug2014; remove ~1,200 contaminant assemblies (human,mouse,bacteria,...)	
pubset6	26886	no-omcl 20Aug2014; intron-miss loci, paralog/alt reclass, v2	
pubset7	27775	arp7bor2b orthology completion, 21Aug2014,	
pubset8	28400	arp7bor3b orthology, 21Sep2014, various checks, ~600 missed loci from analyses	
pubset9a	29074	arp7bor4 orthology, 24Sep2014,	
pubset9b	29127	arp7bor5 orthology, 30Sep2014, found 55 ortho-misses	

**Table 1.** *Daphnia magna* gene set generation The EvidentialGene pipeline with associated sources, processing steps and gene set versions is described. The number of input transcripts (Input\_Tr), the number retained after each step (NR\_out), the *D. magna* gene set associated with each step and the data source (either this study or available at the time of the analysis is shown). The Stages 1–3 refer to the pipeline description in the methods section.

An in depth analysis of the different gene sets and discussion of reliability of validation methods will be presented elsewhere.

Data Records

*Daphnia magna* transcriptome and related data are published under the International Nucleotide Sequence Database Collaboration BioProject PRJNA284518 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/?term=PRJNA284518>). The *D. magna* consensus transcriptome for each of the three genotypes studied here and the raw data for each library obtained from different environmental perturbations are deposited in GenBank (Data Citation 1, metadata in Supplementary Table 2). RNA-seq read and transcript assemblies of RNA-Seq data can be found at this entry. Transcript assemblies generated separately for the two inbred strains are also available at GenBank (*Daphnia magna* Xinb3, Data Citation 2; *Daphnia magna* Inb1, Data Citation 3). The X assembly contains 42,990 loci with 253,834 transcripts.

The I assembly contains 36,935 loci with 271,331 transcripts. The X and I annotated assemblies contain coding-sequence validated for primary and alternate transcripts from stage 2 in the EvidentialGene pipeline above (Table 1, Dapma6tx and Dapma6ti clone sets), with loci determined by shared exons. Links to public gene set IDs are included with each transcript assembly. The complete hybrid mRNA-assembly and genome-modelled *D. magna* gene set, and draft genome assembly, in standard sequence and GFF annotation data formats, is publicly available at [http://wfleabase.org/genome/Daphnia\\_magna/openaccess/genes/](http://wfleabase.org/genome/Daphnia_magna/openaccess/genes/). The *D. magna* gene proteins are also available at UniProt <http://www.uniprot.org/uniprot/?query=taxonomy:35525>.

Technical Validation

Metrics of RNA—seq data


A total of 7.2 billion reads were generated, with an average of 107.5 million reads per sample (s.d. 22 million read pairs). The number of reads was 3.5billion (1.75 billion read pairs) for the X, 2.8 billion (1.4 billion read pairs) for I, and 0.8 billion (0.4 billion read pairs) for XI. Of the total number of reads, 77% for X, 81% for I and 77% for XI had quality scores above 30 (analysed with FastQC software<sup>47</sup>, Table 2). In Table 3 (available online only) we show a detailed analysis of the RNA-Seq data per sample including raw data read pairs before and after trimming quality was applied, as well as insert size. Approximately 70% of the reads retained their full length of 101 bases after trimming (Table 3) (available online only). Insert size for each paired-read library was estimated by mapping a random subsample of 1,000,000 reads per sample to the mitochondrial genome sequence on the reference draft genome (reference genome ver.2.4). The size of the insert for each concordantly mapped read pair was estimated and the average drawn over all such read pairs. The insert size for each sample is shown in Table 3 (available online only).

When using primary transcripts only, the number of reads mapping onto the transcriptome ranged between 61 and 78% (Fig. 2, Table 4 (available online only)). This percentage reached 98% of all reads when primary and alternate transcripts were used (Table 5). If the same read mapped multiple times onto the same transcript, it was counted only once for that transcript. Multiple mapped reads can be alternate transcripts of the same gene or the result of incomplete mapping likely caused by partial sequence of a transcript. The reads mapping to multiple locations will be object of future studies and hence are not discussed further. The read counts per gene ID are shown in Supplementary Table 1.

	X	I	XI
Number of read pairs	3,403,673,296	2,812,630,218	443,120,153
Median read pairs per sample	66,965,781	57,197,308	22,617,799.5
Mean read pairs per sample	68,073,465.92	58,596,462.88	24,617,786.28
Number of reads pairs with phred score >30	2,621,703,528	2,273,042,316	341,213,774
Mean phred score per sequence	32.67	33.29	33.73
Median phred score per sequence	35.00	36.00	35.86
Number of environmental exposures	8	8	6
Number of libraries	25	24	18

**Table 2.** RNA—Seq metrics overview. The number of total read pairs refers to the total pair read counts per genotype. The median and mean read pairs per sample refer to the sample specific read pairs, where samples constitute the individual exposures including multiple biological replicates of the same genotype per condition. In addition, the fraction of read pairs with phred >30 with respective mean and median values are shown. Number of environmental exposures indicates the number of environmental perturbations to which the genotypes were exposed. The number of libraries constructed per sample is shown; for the X genotype 25 libraries were constructed, including 2 controls as the exposures were completed over two days. For the I genotype 24 libraries were constructed. For the XI genotype 18 libraries were constructed.





**Figure 2.** Percentage of mapped read pairs. Percentage of read pairs per samples mapping to unique (black bars) or to multiple locations (grey bars) in the reference transcriptome of *D. magna*.

Strain	mRNA set	TotR	MapR	%Map
X	all	3233374500	3172301416	98.1%
I	all	2789627581	2736214261	98.1%
XI	all	885996197	857334019	96.8%
X	primary	3233374500	2814739850	87.1%
I	primary	2789627581	2429376789	87.1%
XI	primary	885996197	791867853	89.4%

**Table 5.** RNA-Seq read mapping statistics. RNA-Seq reads mapping onto *Daphnia magna* transcripts for the X, I and XI genotypes are shown for alternates (all) and primary transcripts (mRNA set). Read pairs were mapped to transcripts with GSNAP (2014-05-15, opts:-N 0 --gmap-mode = none --pairexpect = 400). The total number of reads (TotR), the number of mapper reads (MapR) and the percentage of mapped reads (%Map) is shown.

The total number of transcripts retained in this study after trimming and quality checks mapped onto 29,128 genes identified with the EvidentialGene model described above. The distribution of read pairs per gene is summarized in Supplementary Table 1. Between 26,508 and 28,187 transcripts were retrieved across the three genotypes (Table 6). The coverage in bp was highest for the X genotype with 5,282.66 and

lowest for the XI genotype with 1,952.93 bp (Table 6). The difference in transcript-read map rates indicated in Tables 4 and 5 results from two main factors: (a) alternate transcripts account for 15% of the difference (all versus primary in Table 5) and (b) roughly a 10% difference in mapping of primary transcripts can be observed when different methods are adopted. For example GSNAP trims read ends to facilitate alignment to reference similarly to transcript assembly methods that trim and shred reads, whereas other methods like Bowtie do not trim ends.

### Allelic variants

After removing base positions with frequency lower than 1% which can be explained as sequencing errors<sup>32</sup>, we identified allelic variants with 2 to 4 alleles as compared to the reference set of single copy genes. The large majority of variants had one or two alleles as expected for a diploid organism (Table 7), confirming the high quality of our sequences. A small fraction of variants had 3 and 4 alleles. When a cut-off value of 5% on allelic variant calls was applied these variants were further reduced in number. From visual inspection of the alignment we assessed that these variants interested a very small fraction of the transcriptome.

### Reproducibility of biological replicates

A Principal Component Analysis on trimmed transcripts was used to assess the quality of the RNA-Seq data in terms of reproducibility across the biological replicates. The PCA plot inclusive of all data identified the sample I\_BN\_r3 as an outlier (Fig. 3a). This sample was removed from downstream analysis as it obscured any signal from both the genotype and the treatment. The PCA plots excluding this outlier showed a clear aggregation of replicates per genotype (Fig. 3b). PCA plots produced separately per natural genotype showed a roughly random distribution of the read counts along the two principal components (Fig. 3c,d) with a tendency of the first replica (r1) to cluster apart from the other two replicates. This may be the effect of slightly earlier developmental stage in r1 as compared to the other two replicas. In the PCA plot of the recombinant line (Fig. 3e), three treatments cluster separately from the others contributing more than 20% to the overall variance along both axes. These are the treatments with exposures of 24 h.

### Gene models validation

We generated a public gene catalogue for *D. magna* version evg7f9b1, for release to the scientific community. This hybrid gene set produced from both mRNA and genome gene models is available at wFleaBase.org with components available in International Nucleotide Sequence Database (INSDC).


Of the total 29,128 gene loci identified in *D. magna*, 26,825 (92%) genes were assembled from mRNA, and 2,296 (8%) were genome-modelled. 22,059 (76%) of the total recovered genes were complete proteins, and 7,068 (24%) partial proteins. All of these loci are supported by mRNA-Seq and/or protein homology evidence; 65% (18,962) of these genes map completely onto the *D. magna* draft genome assembly 2.4, and 99% (28,127) contains RNA-Seq reads unique to a specific locus. 76% of the total gene loci identified in *D. magna* show homology to other species (blastp  $e \leq 1e-5$  to proteins or conserved domains) and 18% (5,170) show homology only to other *Daphnia* species. Finally, 40% of the recovered genes were orthologs to other species using orthology criteria of OrthoMCL, and 16% were paralogs of

Strain	X	I	XI
Number of Transcripts	27,441	28,187	26,508
Length of Transcripts	48,072,095	48,822,339	47,088,659
Number of Bases Mapped	253,948,429,576	217,093,998,202	91,961,017,164
Coverage (bp)	5,282.66	4,446.61	1,952.93

**Table 6.** Transcripts statistics. The number of transcripts retained after trimming, their length, the total number of bases mapped and the total coverage (in bp) per sample are shown.

Alleles	X	I	XI
≤ 2	17,252	23,329	23,436
3	607	580	614
4	45	25	24

**Table 7.** Allelic variants. Allelic variants identified in the three genotypes used in this study as compared to the reference set of single copy genes from the *D. magna* consensus transcriptome are shown. A cut-off of 1% was applied before allelic variants call.




**Figure 3.** PCA plots. (a) PCA plots including all data, three genotypes (X, I, XI) and their biological replicates; genotypes X and I are in green, whereas genotype XI is in orange. The outlier treatment is the non-toxic cyanobacteria treatment on the I genotype (I\_BN\_r3 in panel a); (b) PCA plot including the three genotypes and their biological replicates except for the outlier HS\_BN\_Ir3; (c) PCA plot for the genotype X and its biological replicates; (d) PCA plot for the genotype I and its biological replicates; (e) PCA plot for the XI genotype and its replicates. Treatments short names are as in Fig. 1; they are depicted with different colours within each panel. The replicates are identified by different symbols.

orthologs. 44% (12,826) of the total set of identified gene loci do not cluster with other species genes. This proportion can be considered unique or evolved in *D. magna*, although many genes derive homology from other species. The high number of *Daphnia* evolved genes is not unexpected considering the large number of eco-responsive genes identified in the related congener *D. pulex*<sup>48</sup> and the fact that *Daphnia* species are among the first crustaceans with a draft genome sequence obtained from exposures to ecological stressors. We used the draft genome assembly of *D. magna* v 2.4 as part of the gene construction and validation process. Of this finished gene set, 65% (18,962) map properly onto the assembly with a coverage  $\geq 80\%$ ; 35% (10,189) of the genes mapped with low quality scores; 12% (3,389) remained un-mapped, 12% (3,386) partially-mapped, and 12% (3,414) showed split-mapping. These mapped genes include hundreds of trans-spliced and anti-sense loci where mRNA/protein and introns have reversed orientation. Finally, 14% of the genes that could be mapped were single-exon loci. Some of the conflicts among the physical map in the genome assembly v2.4, partially mapped genes and other complexity are artifactual results of draft genome missassemblies. Other of these complexities are located on well assembled portions, including the anti-sense transcription, and appear as true biological complexities. An instance of putative horizontal gene transfer, bacteria to *Daphnia*, was uncovered during contaminant screening. This has been reported in *Daphnia pulex*<sup>49</sup> as a kairomone-stress responsive horizontal gene transfer (HGT) gene, and appears to exist in the draft genome of *D. magna*, *D. pulex*, and in *D. galeata* (personal observation DG). An automated contaminant screening

Species	aaSize	Frag%	OrMiss	OrGroup
<i>Daphnia magna</i>	46	1.8%	18	11523
<i>Daphnia pulex</i>	– 25	5.1%	36	11670
<i>Tribolium castaneum</i>	– 26	4.1%	42	8765
<i>Apis mellifera</i>	38	3.1%	161	8682
<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	68	1.8%	203	7801

**Table 8.** Gene set completeness. Completeness of species gene sets is measured with average protein sizes and orthology group presence with OrthoMCL analysis. aaSize: average deviation from reference species protein sizes; Fragment%: percent gene size outliers below 2 s.d. of group median size; OrMiss: number of missed ortho-groups that are common to other species; OrGroup: number of orthology groups found.



**Figure 4.** BUSCO analysis. Stacked bar plots showing proportions of gene sets in quality categories for *D. magna* and 4 other arthropod species. Two gene sets are represented per species, as described in methods, to show effects of construction methods on quality. The categories of genes are: i) complete single copy BUSCO: genes which match a single gene in the BUSCO reference group; ii) fragmented BUSCOs: genes only partially recovered for which the gene length exceeds the alignment length cut-off; iii) missing BUSCO: not recovered genes. Abbreviation for species names are as follows: Dma = *Daphnia magna*; Dpu = *Daphnia pulex*; Ame = *Apis mellifera*; Tca = *Tribolium castaneum*; Fly = *Drosophila melanogaster*. The gene sets sources used for the 4 arthropod species are as follows: 1) **Dma\_14EV** dapmagevg14; Evigene mRNA+genome, 2014.08; 2) **Dma\_11G** dapmag11; Evigene genome genes, 2011; 3) **Dpu\_10EG** dapplx10evg; Evigene genome genes, 2010; 4) **Dpu\_07G** dapplxg11; genome genes, 2007, doi: 10.1126/science.1197761; 5) **Ame\_14EV** apisevg14; Evigene mRNA assembly 2014.06; 6) **Ame\_12G** apis45; OGS v3.2 genome genes, 2012, doi: 10.1186/1471-2164-15-86; 7) **Tca\_14EV** tribcas4evg2; Evigene mRNA assembly, 2014.12; 8) **Tca\_12G** tribcas4aug; AUGUSTUS genome genes, tcas4.0, 2014; 9) **Fly\_13** drosme1548n; Flybase release 5.48, 2013; 10) **Fly\_04** drosme14; Flybase release 4.0, 2004.

flagged this as a contaminant, but further examination of evidence indicates probable *Daphnia* genomic source, with a potential ecological relevance of this gene to *Daphnia* species.

### Assessing the transcriptome annotation completeness

Evidence of high quality and completeness of the *D. magna* genes was provided by both OrthoMCL and the BUSCO analyses (Table 8 and Fig. 4). According to the OrthoMCL assessment, the current *D. magna* genes are as or more complete than related arthropods gene sets, with few orthologs missing, a higher number of complete genes, and a lower number of fragment outliers detected (Table 8). In the BUSCO analysis *D. magna* gene set showed the lowest proportion of missing and fragmented single copy orthologs as compared to the other four arthropod but for two other sets: *Amel4evg* and *Tca14evg* (Fig. 4). Notably, the species showing the most complete gene sets in our analysis were the ones in which the EvidentialGene methods was applied. A complete analysis of this method's performance versus other methods is beyond the scope of the present paper and will be discussed elsewhere.

The STRESSFLEA consortium was a collaborative network of 10 Universities, including 7 European and 2 North American Universities. The effort of this consortium allowed us to produce a comprehensive transcriptome data set and a frozen gene catalogue for the premier model system *D. magna*. This effort paves the way to powerful discoveries in environmental and functional genomics elevating *D. magna* to the rank of genomics empowered ecological model species.

### References

- Altshuler, I. *et al.* An integrated multi-disciplinary approach for studying multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems: *Daphnia* as a model organism. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **51**, 623–633 (2011).
- Miner, B. E., De Meester, L., Pfrender, M. E., Lampert, W. & Hairston, N. G. Linking genes to communities and ecosystems: *Daphnia* as an ecogenomic model. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **279**, 1873–1882 (2012).
- Adamowicz, S. J., Petrusek, A., Colbourne, J. K., Hebert, P. D. & Witt, J. D. The scale of divergence: a phylogenetic appraisal of intercontinental allopatric speciation in a passively dispersed freshwater zooplankton genus. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **50**, 423–436 (2009).
- Ebert, D. Ecology, epidemiology, and evolution of parasitism in *Daphnia*. Bethesda (MD) National Library of Medicine (US), National Center for Biotechnology, (2005).
- Drenner, R. W., Strickler, J. R. & O'Brien, W. J. Capture probability: role of zooplankton escape in selective feeding of planktivorous fish. *J. Fish. Res. Board. Can.* **35**, 1370–1373 (1978).
- Louette, G. & De Meester, L. Predation and priority effects in experimental zooplankton communities. *Oikos* **116**, 419–426 (2007).
- Rabus, M., Waterkeyn, A., Van Pottelbergh, N., Brendonck, L. & Laforsch, C. Interclonal variation, effectiveness and long-term implications of Triops-induced morphological defences in *Daphnia magna*. *Journal of Plankton Research* **34**, 152–160 (2012).
- Brett, M. T. *et al.* Species-dependent effects of zooplankton on planktonic ecosystem processes in Castle Lake, California. *Ecology* **75**, 2243–2254 (1994).
- Lemaire, V. *et al.* Genotype x genotype interactions between the toxic cyanobacterium *Microcystis* and its grazer, the waterflea *Daphnia*. *Evol. Appl.* **5**, 168–182 (2012).
- Loureiro, C., Pereira, J. L., Pedrosa, M. A., Goncalves, F. & Castro, B. B. Competitive outcome of *Daphnia-Simocephalus* experimental microcosms: salinity versus priority effects. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e70572 (2013).
- Decaestecker, E. *et al.* Host-parasite Red Queen dynamics archived in pond sediment. *Nature* **450**, 870–874 (2007).
- Khan, F. R. *et al.* Accumulation Dynamics and Acute Toxicity of Silver Nanoparticles to *Daphnia magna* and *Lumbriculus variegatus*: Implications for Metal Modeling Approaches. *Environmental Science & Technology* **9**, 4389–4397 (2015).
- Li, L. Z. *et al.* A metabolomic study on the responses of *Daphnia magna* exposed to silver nitrate and coated silver nanoparticles. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* **119**, 66–73 (2015).
- Lee, S. *et al.* Ecotoxicological assessment of cimetidine and determination of its potential for endocrine disruption using three test organisms: *Daphnia magna*, *Moina macrocopa*, and *Danio rerio*. *Chemosphere* **135**, 208–216 (2015).
- Simpson, A. M., Jeyasingh, P. D. & Belden, J. B. Variation in toxicity of a current-use insecticide among resurrected *Daphnia pulex* genotypes. *Ecotoxicology* **24**, 488–496 (2015).
- Zhang, L., Liu, J., Liu, H., Wan, G. & Zhang, S. The occurrence and ecological risk assessment of phthalate esters (PAEs) in urban aquatic environments of China. *Ecotoxicology* **24**, 967–984 (2015).
- Frisch, D. *et al.* A millennial-scale chronicle of evolutionary responses to cultural eutrophication in *Daphnia*. *Ecol. Lett.* **17**, 360–368 (2014).
- Latta, L. C., Weider, L. J., Colbourne, J. K. & Pfrender, M. E. The evolution of salinity tolerance in *Daphnia*: a functional genomics approach. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 794–802 (2012).
- Orsini, L., Spanier, K. I. & De Meester, L. Genomic signature of natural and anthropogenic stress in wild populations of the waterflea *Daphnia magna*: validation in space, time and experimental evolution. *Molecular Ecology* **21**, 2160–2175 (2012).
- Scoville, A. G. & Pfrender, M. E. Phenotypic plasticity facilitates recurrent rapid adaptation to introduced predators. *Proc. Natl Acad Sci USA* **107**, 4260–4263 (2010).
- Yampolsky, L. Y. *et al.* Functional genomics of acclimation and adaptation in response to thermal stress in *Daphnia*. *BMC Genomics* **15**, 859 (2014).
- Gilbert, D. G. euGenes, a eukaryote organism genome information service. *Nucleic Acids Research* **30**, 145–148 (2002).
- Routtu, J. *et al.* An SNP-based second-generation genetic map of *Daphnia magna* and its application to QTL analysis of phenotypic traits. *BMC Genomics* **15**, 1033 (2014).
- Colbourne, J. K., Singan, V. R. A. & Gilbert, D. wFleaBase: the *Daphnia* genome database. *BMC Bioinformatics* **6**, 45 (2005).
- Routtu, J., Jansen, B., Colson, I., De Meester, L. & Ebert, D. The first-generation *Daphnia magna* linkage map. *BMC Genomics* **11**, 508 (2010).
- Klüttgen, B., U., D., Engels, M. & T., R. H. Combined effects of 3,4-dichloroaniline and food concentration on life-table data of two related cladocerans, *Daphnia magna* and *Ceriodaphnia quadrangula*. *Chemosphere* **32**, 2015–2028 (1994).
- Coors, A. & De Meester, L. Fitness and virulence of a bacterial endoparasite in an environmentally stressed crustacean host. *Parasitology* **138**, 122–131 (2011).
- Ahola, V. *et al.* The *Glanville* fritillary genome retains an ancient karyotype and reveals selective chromosomal fusions in Lepidoptera. *Nature Communications* **5**, 4737 (2014).



29. Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M. & Usadel, B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).
30. Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S. L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat. Methods* **9**, 357–359 (2012).
31. Labbe, P., McTaggart, S. J. & Little, T. J. An ancient immunity gene duplication in *Daphnia magna*: RNA expression and sequence analysis of two nitric oxide synthase genes. *Developmental and Comparative Immunology* **33**, 1000–1010 (2009).
32. Lou, D. I. *et al.* High-throughput DNA sequencing errors are reduced by orders of magnitude using circle sequencing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **110**, 19872–19877 (2013).
33. Schulz, M. H., Zerbino, D. R., Vingron, M. & Birney, E. Oases: robust de novo RNA-seq assembly across the dynamic range of expression levels. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 1086–1092 (2012).
34. Zerbino, D. R. & Birney, E. Velvet: Algorithms for de novo short read assembly using de Bruijn graphs. *Genome Research* **18**, 821–829 (2008).
35. Xie, Y. *et al.* SOAPdenovo-Trans: De novo transcriptome assembly with short RNA-Seq reads. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 1660–1666 (2014).
36. Grabherr, M. G. *et al.* Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. *Nature Biotechnology* **29**, 644–652 (2011).
37. Haas, B. J. *et al.* Improving the Arabidopsis genome annotation using maximal transcript alignment assemblies. *Nucleic Acids Research* **31**, 5654–5666 (2003).
38. Trapnell, C. & Salzberg, S. L. How to map billions of short reads onto genomes. *Nature Biotechnology* **27**, 455–457 (2009).
39. Stanke, M., Schöffmann, O., Morgenstern, B. & Waack, S. Gene prediction in eukaryotes with a generalized hidden Markov model that uses hints from external sources. *BMC Bioinformatics* **7**, 62 (2006).
40. Enright, J., Dongen, S. V. & Ouzounis, C. An efficient algorithm for large-scale detection of protein families. *Nucleic Acids Research* **30**, 1575–1584 (2002).
41. Li, L. Jr., Stoeckert, C. J. & Roos, D. S. OrthoMCL: identification of ortholog groups for eukaryotic genomes. *Genome Research* **13**, 2178–2189 (2003).
42. Conesa, A. & Gotz, S. Blast2GO: A Comprehensive Suite for Functional Analysis in Plant Genomics. *Int J Plant Genomics* **2008**, 619832 (2008).
43. Thibaud-Nissen F., Souvorov A., Murphy T., DiCuccio M. & Kitts P. Eukaryotic genome annotation pipeline in *The NCBI Handbook*, (ed National Center for Biotechnology Information (US)) (NCBI, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK169439/>, 2013).
44. Haas, B. J., Zeng, Q., Pearson, M. D., Cuomo, C. A. & Wortman, J. R. Approaches to Fungal Genome Annotation. *Mycology* **2**, 118–141 (2011).
45. Holt, C. & Yandell, M. D. MAKER2: an annotation pipeline and genome-database management tool for second-generation genome projects. *BMC Bioinformatics* **12**, 491 (2011).
46. Simão, F. A., Waterhouse, R. M., Ioannidis, P., Kriventseva, E. V. & Zdobnov, E. M. BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 3210–3212 (2015).
47. Andrews, S. FastQC: A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. <http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/> (2010).
48. Colbourne, J. K. *et al.* The ecoresponsive genome of *Daphnia pulex*. *Science* **331**, 555–561 (2011).
49. Miyakawa, H. *et al.* Gene up-regulation in response to predator kairomones in the water flea, *Daphnia pulex*. *BMC Developmental Biology* **10**, 45 (2010).

## Data Citations

1. NCBI Sequence Read Archive SRP059260 (2015).
2. Gilbert, D. G. GenBank GDIP000000000 (2015).
3. Gilbert, D. G. GenBank GDIQ000000000 (2015).

## Acknowledgements

This research was financially supported by the ESF EUROCORES Programme EuroEEFG, Grant 09-EEFG-FP-040. The KU Leuven team was supported by FWO project STRESSFLEA-B (G061411N) and by the KU Leuven Research Fund (coordination grant and grant PF/2010/07). Kevin Pauwels helped with the exposure experiments; Veerle Lemaire, Aline Waterkeyn, Isabel Vanoverberghe and Nellie Konijnendijck provided material for exposures. The University of Notre Dame team was supported by NIH grant R24-GM078274 to MEP. The University of Helsinki Team was supported by Academy of Finland grants 250444, 284601 and 135291. Sayanty Roy, Kerry Regan, Jihyun Won and Jackie Lopez conducted the exposure experiments and RNA isolation for the recombinant genotype. Seanna McTaggart provided additional RNA-seq transcriptome clone data for the public *D. magna* gene set. Donald Gilbert has been supported by the National Science Foundation (grant No. 0640462 to DGG), including genomics computational resources via TeraGrid amd XSEDE. Jana Asselman is the recipient of a FWO scholarship.

## Author Contributions

L.O. and L.D.M. coordinated the STRESSFLEA consortium and manuscript writing with input from D.G., M.P., M.F., M.J.R., D.E., J.A., J.K.C., and M.J. L.O. coordinated the research activities, contributed to the exposures on the two natural clones, and coordinated data analysis. D.G. assembled transcriptomes, constructed annotated gene sets, contributed to expression analyses, provided genome database with these data, coordinated and performed public database submissions. R.P. performed data processing, validation, analyses of transcriptome data, and public database submissions. M.J. coordinated and performed the exposures of the two natural clones. J.B. and O.S.S. were responsible of the downstream analysis of the transcriptome data. K.S. contributed to the downstream analysis. J.K.C. contributed to the paper writing and experimental design. D.R. contributed to the data analysis including mapping and downstream analysis. J.A. and D.G. performed the BUSCO analysis. D.E. collected and bred the *D. magna* clones and produced purified samples of two parasite strains. J.K. prepared samples for RNA -seq and performed QC. C.L. contributed to experimental design provided invertebrate predators. M.E.P.

coordinated the exposures on the recombinant clone and contributed to data analysis. M.J.F. generated the RNA-Seq data for the natural strains. All authors contributed to manuscript editing and discussion on experimental design.

### Additional Information

Tables 3 and 4 are only available in the online version of this paper.

Supplementary Information accompanies this paper at <http://www.nature.com/sdata>

**Competing financial interests:** The authors declare no competing financial interests.

**How to cite this article:** Orsini, L. *et al.* *Daphnia magna* transcriptome by RNA-Seq across 12 environmental stressors. *Sci. Data* 3:160030 doi: 10.1038/sdata.2016.30 (2016).



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if the material is not included under the Creative Commons license, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder to reproduce the material. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Metadata associated with this Data Descriptor is available at <http://www.nature.com/sdata/> and is released under the CC0 waiver to maximize reuse.